DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 842 SP 008 751

AUTHOR	Millard, Joseph; Brooks, Richard
TITLE	Selection Research Project Evaluation: A Three Year Study. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Polk and Story Joint County School System, Ankeny, Iowa.
PUB DATE	Sep 74
NOTE	57p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation; Personnel Selection; Phonotape Recordings; Teacher Placement; *Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

Selection Research Incorporated (SRI) assisted in the selection of teachers for two school districts in Polk County, Iowa by analyzing audiotaped interviews with the top three or four candidates for each position and matching the candidates with previously prepared profiles of the school districts. Candidates were labeled highly recommended, recommended, conditionally recommended, or not recommended. A 3-year evaluation study of the SRI process was conducted to determine its success by surveying the SRI teachers, their peers, administrators, and students. Data were collected using questionnaires consisting of items related to effective teaching. Using the data, the appraisals of SRI teachers by their peers, administrators, and students were compared with the recommendations of the SRI psychologists. The following conclusions are warranted based on study results: (a) the SRI process of identifying teachers who are likely to be successful in a given school district is reasonably successful; (b) the SRI method appears to be most successful in identifying probable success in a district where the criterion of success is student rating; (c) SRI is not equally effective in every district; and (d) the SRI service is a useful process for teacher selection if it is used in the manner for which it was designed. When the SRI service is utilized, periodic evaluation is recommended. (HMD)

ED 100842

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SELECTION RESEARCH PROJECT EVALUATION

A Three Year Study

Final Report

September 1974

Joint County School System of Polk and Story Counties
1932 Ordnance Road, Ankeny, Iowa 50021
K. W. Miller, Superintendent

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP005 751

Prepared by: Joseph Millard, Director of Research
Joint County School System

Richard Brooks, Professor of Education
Drake University

INTRODUCTION

School administrators use a variety of methods to screen applicants for teaching positions. Past supervisors' comments, personal references, college records, interviews, test scores--these are but a few of the tools used by modern administrators in attempting to select good teachers.

Recently, in view of a variety of circumstances, school systems have begun to examine the possibility of using outside resources in the selection of teachers. The Joint County Educational Service Center sponsored the "Selection Research Project" to determine the effectiveness of using an outside interviewer in selecting teachers. The project was conducted over a three-year period, the 1971-72, 1972-73, and 1973-74 school years.

In this study, Selection Research Incorporated (SRI), of Lincoln, Nebraska, provided the outside interviews. The firm has had a successful record in the screening of candidates for positions in other fields, such as the insurance industry and the management of franchise restaurants.

In the process of selecting a new teacher, the local school district conducts an audio-taped interview of the top three or four applicants for a given position (as judged by the traditional means of selection). The structured interview is from one to two hours in length. Upon completion of this interview, the audio tape is mailed to the SRI center in Lincoln, where a psychologist analyzes the tape and places the candidate into one of four categories: 1) Highly Recommended, 2) Recommended, 3) Conditionally Recommended or, 4) Not Recommended.

These categories have been developed on the basis of school "profiles" which involve extensive interviewing of administrators and currently-employed

teachers. The profiles were developed in the spring of 1971. The responses on the audio tapes can be matched to the profiles by the psychologists. The school system is, of course, free to hire or not hire a given teacher regardless of the SRI recommendations. The SRI recommendation is intended only to provide one more tool for the administrators in the selection process.

Two suburban Polk County, Iowa, school districts, Urbandale and West Des Moines, participated in the Selection Research Project. In the past three years Urbandale has hired 81 teachers and West Des Moines has hired 107 teachers, all rated by the SRI procedure. This is the third year and final report for the three-year Selection Research Project.

At the start of the third year evaluation, 74 Urbandale teachers were employed who had been rated by the SRI process. In West Des Moines 92 SRI rated teachers were employed.

The purpose of the study is to determine the effectiveness of using an outside interview technique in screening teachers. Answers to the following questions are being sought:

1. Are the Highly Recommended and Recommended teachers rated differently from the Conditionally Recommended and Not Recommended teachers by their respective students?
2. Are the Highly Recommended and Recommended teachers rated differently from the Conditionally Recommended and Not Recommended teachers by their co-workers?
3. Are the Highly Recommended and Recommended teachers rated differently from the Conditionally Recommended and Not Recommended Teachers by their individual school building administrators?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. If there are differences between the Highly Recommended/ Recommended teachers and the Conditionally Recommended/ Not Recommended teachers on student and colleague rating scales, what are the degrees of those differences?

IMPORTANCE OF THIS STUDY

At this time, there is no research base to support or reject the SRI selection procedure. It is, therefore, important that an evaluation of the procedure be undertaken. This evaluation is of the utmost importance to students, because if better teachers can be identified by this process, schools will be in a position to improve education by selecting better teaching professionals. The evaluation also is important to parents, since they are interested in having the best teachers possible for their children--and if the system is successful, better teachers could be hired by schools.

And the study is important for teachers. They are interested in what kinds of selection procedures will be used in the future to fill teaching positions. If the selection procedure was successful and valid, the possibility that a teacher would take a job in a school system in which he or she would ultimately be unhappy would diminish.

Finally, and most specifically, this study is of importance to the public school districts in Polk and Story Counties. They have a need to know whether the rating system provided by the SRI method does in fact identify persons who will perform well as teachers in their schools. The findings from the Urbandale and West Des Moines pilot project will be disseminated to all Joint County schools. If the SRI procedure does identify better

teachers as rated by co-workers, by students and by administrators, then other districts might well be interested in adopting the procedure.

It is of further importance, conversely, to discover if the rating system fails to identify teachers more accurately. For if the SRI system makes no significant difference, school systems should be aware of the findings and other selection procedures examined or new ones developed.

The findings of this investigation will be made available to all interested schools in Iowa and throughout the nation.

METHODOLOGY

In an effort to answer the questions listed above, an evaluation of the SRI service was conducted jointly by Richard D. Brooks, Ph.D. of the Drake University College of Education faculty and Joseph E. Millard, Ph.D., Director of Research and Development at the Joint County Educational Service Center of Polk and Story Counties.

Identical questionnaires were developed for the two school systems, West Des Moines and Urbandale. The teacher questionnaire and the student questionnaire were developed in part from the "Styles of Teaching Inventory" published in a 1968 Science Research Associates, Inc. (SRA) publication entitled Teacher Self-Assessment. The publication is no longer in print. The SRA instrument was modified to meet the needs of the project and submitted to the two school districts for approval. After a few minor modifications, the questionnaire was approved and printed.

The items in the teacher self-rating questionnaire are similar to the corresponding items in the student questionnaire. This design was established so that students would be rating teachers on the same qualities as the teachers were rating themselves. After the first year, results of the

self-rating teacher questionnaire, because of the nature of the information, were not analyzed. The data were simply collected and reported in Appendix B.

The questionnaires were printed on computer scoring forms for easy item-analysis. The Mid-Iowa Educational Computer Center (MIECC), 1800 Grand, Des Moines, Iowa, prepared a computer program to analyze the data. (Teacher Questionnaire--Appendix A; and Student Questionnaire--Appendix A)

For the first-year, evaluation questionnaires were distributed to all Urbandale teachers for administration during the third week in January, and distributed in West Des Moines for administration during the fourth week in January, 1972. The differences in time and in the number of teachers completing the questionnaire were related to individual school schedules. At this time, all Urbandale teachers and the 33 SRI teachers in West Des Moines answered the questionnaire with respect to their own teaching. Of the Urbandale teachers, only the responses of the 31 SRI teachers were analyzed for this report.

For the second year evaluation, questionnaires were delivered to both school districts the first week in January, 1973, where student and self-rating questionnaires were to be administered. During the second year there were 51 Urbandale SRI teachers and 54 West Des Moines SRI teachers participating in the study. Thirty-one of the Urbandale teachers were second-year teachers and 20 were first-year teachers. In West Des Moines, 26 were second-year teachers and 28 were first-year teachers.

Teacher and student questionnaires were delivered to both school districts in January, 1974, for collection of third-year data. The questionnaires were to be administered at the beginning of the second semester. Sixty-two Urbandale teachers and 84 West Des Moines teachers participated in the third-year investigation. In Urbandale, 20 of these were third-year teachers, 13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

were second-year teachers and 29 were first-year teachers. Seventeen of the West Des Moines participants were in their third year in that district; 24 were in their second year in West Des Moines and it was the first year of teaching in Weat Des Moines for 43 of the teachers.

Only the SRI teachers in West Des Moines participated in the study. The entire Urbandale faculty participated in completing the questionnaires but this study reports only the findings of the Urbandale and West Des Moines SRI-rated teachers.

The first year, 707 student questionnaires were used in the study from Urbandale students. Because of the increase in SRI-rated teachers, 905 student questionnaires were used in the second-year study and 1,174 in the third-year study. West Des Moines students supplied 503 usable questionnaires for the first year, 977 usable student questionnaires the second year and 1,476 the third year. Only students in grades four through twelve who were taught by an SRI teacher completed a questionnaire about their teacher.

At the secondary level and in classes at other levels at which teachers met with several groups of students regularly, the teachers were asked to have one class answer the questionnaire -- or, as an option, they could randomly select six students from each of five different classes to complete the questionnaire. In self-contained classrooms the administration of the questionnaire was facilitated by the teacher's having only the one group of students to whom the questionnaire was administered.

During the winter of 1971-72 a self concept measure (Student Self-Questionnaire--Appendix A) also was administered to the 1,058 students. These students were those who participated in the first year rating of SRI teachers. This measure was intended to determine whether students in one

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

school district or students taught by differently-rated teachers had different self concepts. No self-concept differences were found to exist between the students of the two school districts nor among students of teachers rated differently by the SRI method.

Another questionnaire was developed for co-workers. It was intended to measure the cooperativeness and "professional style" of the SRI teachers (Co-Worker Questionnaire--Appendix A). In April, 1972, copies of this questionnaire were distributed to the two school districts for administration after each school had completed formal evaluation of teachers for the academic year. This time-frame was established to avoid confusion by teachers of the co-worker questionnaire with the normal teacher evaluation procedures in effect in the respective school districts. This procedure was repeated in April, 1973, for the second year study, and April, 1974, for the third year study.

To facilitate administering the co-worker questionnaire, the SRI teachers in both school districts were asked to select five co-workers who they believed could best rate their performance. Co-worker is a broadly-based term and is applied to all staff. All of the questionnaires were returned to the Joint County Educational Service Center by the SRI teachers for the first year study.

The co-workers return of questionnaires was less the second year; there was a 99% return of co-worker questionnaires from West Des Moines and 76% return from Urbandale. Usable returns of the co-worker questionnaires for the third year were very good; there was a 99% co-worker questionnaire return from West Des Moines and a 93% return from Urbandale.

The procedure for returning co-worker questionnaires was the same for

all three years. In Urbandale, the co-worker ratings were mailed directly to the Joint County School System. In West Des Moines, the questionnaires were submitted to building principals who returned them to the Joint County school office.

Another questionnaire was added to the study the second year. Building administrators were asked to complete a questionnaire on each of the SRI teachers. This questionnaire was designed by Dr. Brooks and Dr. Millard with help from the Joint County Instructional Services staff to measure the cooperativeness and "teaching style" of the SRI teachers. (Administrator Questionnaire--Appendix A). This was not done the first year because it was believed that individual administrator bias for or against the SRI procedure would be evident. It was believed that by the spring of the second year the individual building administrators would have had more time to observe the teachers and would be less likely to be biased in their ratings.

Copies of the questionnaire were distributed to the two school districts in April, 1973, and were to be administered after each school's formal evaluation of the staff had been completed for that academic year. This questionnaire is not to be confused with the teacher evaluation system used in the school district. The Urbandale administrators returned 93% of the questionnaires the second year and 99% the third year, and the West Des Moines administrators returned 98% of the questionnaires the second year and 99% the third year.

The findings of this study are based on data collected from the several sources. The number of respondents providing usable data for the West Des Moines evaluation are presented in Table 1, and Urbandale data are presented in Table 2.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1

West Des Moines SRI Evaluation Data Collected From These Sources

	1971-72 Participation		1972-73 Participation			
	Hi-1st yr.	Lo-1st yr.	Hi-2nd yr.	Lo-2nd yr.	Hi-1st yr.	Lo-1st yr.
Usable # Student Questionnaire	173	334	164	268	30	443
Usable Co-worker Questionnaire	63	88	53	74	29	111
Usable Administrator Questionnaire	*	*	10	16	4	20
Usable Self-rating Questionnaire	15	18	11	15	6	22

	1973-74 Participation					
	Hi-3rd yr.	Lo-3rd yr.	Hi-2nd yr.	Lo-2nd yr.	Hi-1st yr.	Lo-1st yr.
Usable # Student Questionnaire	75	228	24	336	372	441
Usable Co-worker Questionnaire	35	63	26	92	122	97
Usable Administrator Questionnaire	7	11	4	19	24	22
Usable Self-rating Questionnaire	5	12	5	19	22	21

data collected only from grade levels 4 through 12
* no data collected for that year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

Urbandale SRI Evaluation Data Collected From These Sources

	1971-72 Participation		1972-73 Participation			
	Hi-1st yr.	Lo-1st yr.	Hi-2nd yr.	Lo-2nd yr.	Hi-1st yr.	Lo-1st yr.
Usable # Student Questionnaire	446	57	577	46	291	63
Usable Co-worker Questionnaire	131	19	108	14	60	13
Usable Administrator Questionnaire	*	*	27	4	16	3
Usable Self-rating Questionnaire	27	4	28	3	16	4

	1973-74 Participation					
	Hi-3rd yr.	Lo-3rd yr.	Hi-2nd yr.	Lo-2nd yr.	Hi-1st yr.	Lo-1st yr.
Usable # Student Questionnaire	340	44	197	43	314	236
Usable Co-worker Questionnaire	98	7	51	14	88	47
Usable Administrator Questionnaire	17	1	12	2	15	12
Usable Self-rating Questionnaire	18	2	10	3	18	11

#data collected only from grade levels 4 through 12.
*no data collected for that year

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LIMITATIONS

The limitations placed on action research are greater than most evaluators would desire. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the educational process in the school is of first importance and the evaluation procedure should disrupt the learning situation as little as possible. Because this philosophy was adhered, this study is clearly limited, viz:

1. There was no control group of first, second or third year teachers in either system (i.e. those not SRI-rated). This limitation is not great since comparisons still can be made among groups of teachers rated differently by SRI.
2. The administration of the student questionnaire by the individual teachers may have biased the results. However, the error reflected in the student questionnaire ratings because of teacher administration should be reflected similarly in all groups (highly recommended, recommended, conditionally recommended, and not recommended teachers) and in both schools (Urbandale and West Des Moines).
3. There is some fear on the part of some teachers that this evaluation is an individual teaching evaluation, which was not the case. The data collected for this study are used in evaluating the SRI process and the rating system used by the process. Nevertheless, individual teacher perceptions may be reflected in responses to the questionnaires.
4. There was no control as to the time at which the questionnaires were administered; thus the quality of the study may be somewhat reduced. The cooperation of the two school systems was excellent during this investigation and it should be noted that it would be impossible to control these factors in most investigations.

ANALYSIS

For purposes of analysis, those teachers who were "highly recommended" and "recommended" will be refered to as the "high" group, while those who were "conditionally-recommended" and "not-recommended" will be refered to as the "low" group.

The data for this evaluation consist of mean ratings. For each group of teachers, high and low, the mean rating for each item was calculated for each group of raters. Thus there was a mean rating by students for each of 23 items for the high group of SRI teachers and similar mean ratings for the low group of SRI teachers. Similarly, there are mean ratings for the 12 items for each group of teachers as judged by peers and by administrators. Finally, there are 23 mean item ratings for self-ratings by each group of SRI teachers.

Comparisons between high and low groups were calculated separately by school district. In each case, each mean item rating for the low group was subtracted from the corresponding mean item rating for the high group. This provided 23 differences for student ratings and self ratings, and 12 differences for peer ratings and administrator ratings. Since no significant differences occurred between groups in self ratings the first year, the self rating results are reported as a part of the total information in Appendix B but no further analysis was conducted for this report.

With the data from each district, six comparisons between high and low groups were calculated for student ratings, six for peer ratings and five for administrator ratings. Each such calculation involved determining the mean of the differences across all items of the rating device and the subsequent calculation of a t-test to determine if the average difference

which occurred was or was not likely to be only a chance difference. If the t-value is positive, the high group has a higher average rating than the low group, while if it is negative the reverse is true. If the t-value is large enough to be statistically significant, either positive or negative, the conclusion is that a real difference exists in the perceived effectiveness of one group of teachers when compared to the other. That is, the difference is large enough so that it would rarely occur by chance if there were actually no differences between the two groups of teachers.

The groups of teachers who are subjects for this study and who were employed prior to the 1973-74 school year have been rated more than once by students, peers, and administrators. Consequently, it was possible to compare ratings across years for each group by each of these sets of raters. The differences between mean ratings of first and second year, first and third year and second and third year were calculated by subtracting the mean rating for the former in each case from the mean rating of the latter year, for each group by each set of raters. Again t-tests were used to determine the possible significance of these differences. A positive t-value occurs when the ratings of the latter year are higher while a negative t-value occurs when the earlier year's ratings are higher. Since this is done within groups of teachers and by sets of raters, there are eight student rating comparisons, eight peer rating comparisons, and four such comparisons on the basis of ratings by administrators.

Since it is not feasible to test for a difference of a specific amount when using t-tests, the only legitimate process concerns a test of no difference. Consequently, the test hypotheses for the comparisons described above are as follows:

1. There is no difference in mean ratings by students between

teachers in the high group and those in the low group.

2. There is no difference in mean ratings by peers between teachers in the high group and those in the low group.
3. There is no difference in mean ratings by administrators between teachers in the high group and those in the low group.
4. There are no differences between mean ratings in different years by students of either group of teachers.
5. There are no differences between mean ratings in different years by peers of either group of teachers.
6. There is no difference between successive mean ratings by administrators of either group of teachers.

One additional type of comparison was possible with the available data. This involved comparing the respective mean item ratings of one year with the corresponding mean item ratings for another year. This information was available for student ratings over three years with one group and two years with another, based on their time of employment, as well as with peer ratings across the same years and administrative ratings between the last two years of the study. The technique employed for this purpose was the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient. This correlation process was used to determine if the items which were rated higher in one case were also rated higher in another case, and if those characteristics rated lower in one year were also rated lower for the same group in another year. This technique then indicates the relative stability of observed characteristics across time. If such stability exists, the correlations would be positive and high (approaching 1.00). If not, the correlations would tend to be near zero or even negative. No hypotheses were stated relative to these calculations.

Correlations were calculated for each high group and for each low group

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

across successive years in ratings by students, peers and administrators. Thus there were eight correlation coefficients calculated utilizing student ratings, eight correlations calculated utilizing peer ratings, and four such coefficients were calculated utilizing administrative ratings in each school district.

RESULTS

In order to better see the results and the comparisons across years for the groups of teachers under consideration, the results for each school district will be presented separately.

Tables 3 through 8 concern the ratings of SRI teachers in the West Des Moines schools, and Tables 8 through 13 report the results in the Urbandale schools.

TABLE 3

Mean Ratings and Differences in Mean Ratings by Students of High and Low Groups of West Des Moines SRI Selected Teachers.

(All differences calculated as "high" minus "low")

	Teachers Employed in 71-72			Teachers Employed in 72-73		Teachers Employed in 73-74
	1st yr.	2nd yr.	3rd yr.	1st yr.	2nd yr.	1st yr.
"High" Mean	3.811	3.812	4.006	3.601	4.015	3.934
"Low" Mean	3.707	3.727	3.702	3.712	3.829	3.670
Mean Diff.	.103	.083	.304	-.111	.185	.263
"t"	2.05*	1.60	4.43**	-1.30	3.18**	4.13**

*$\rho < .05$ **$\rho < .01$

Table 3 shows the student ratings of teachers in terms of the mean differences between ratings of the high group and the low group of SRI rated

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

teachers in West Des Moines. For those teachers who were employed the first year (1971-72), the students rated those teachers in the high group significantly more positive than those who were in the low group. The second year, however, the differences which existed between the high and low groups for those employed in 1971-72 was non-significant, that is, the difference which existed at that time, although favoring the high group, could be attributed to chance. In the third year, however, the high group again was rated significantly more positive than the low group. The student ratings for those employed the second year (1972-73), indicated a higher value for the low group than for the high group although the difference was non-significant and could logically be attributed to chance. The last year, however, that this group was rated by students, the high group of teachers rated significantly higher than did the low group. For those teachers employed in 1973-74, the students rated the high group significantly more positive than the low group.

Table 4 shows, by group, the differences in ratings for the high group as well as the differences for the low group in different years as they were rated by students. It also indicates the correlations of the item mean ratings for different years in the students' ratings of these groups of teachers.

Two general characteristics which can be seen in this table are of particular note. First, there were significant differences in the levels at which these teachers were rated in four of the eight comparisons made. In each case the rating for the latter year was significantly higher than the ratings for the prior year. The other four differences are all non-significant, implying that whatever differences did exist are merely chance differences.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 4

Mean Differences Between Student Ratings of "High" Teachers and "Low" Teachers in Different Years and Correlations Between Ratings in Different Years for West Des Moines SRI Selected Teachers.

(Differences calculated used latter year data minus former year data in each case)

	Teachers Employed in 1971-72						Teachers Employed in 1972-73	
	"High" Group			"Low" Group			"High" Group	"Low" Group
	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	2nd-1st yr.
Mean Diff.	.001	.195	.195	.020	-.005	-.025	.413	.117
"t"	.034	4.70**	5.10**	.709	-.158	-1.074	6.660**	4.362**
r	.96	.94	.94	.96	.97	.88	.89	.96

**$p < .01$

Second, the correlation coefficients in each case are very high. Characteristics which students see most positively in a teacher are seen consistently by different student groups when looking at the same teachers. Those characteristics which were rated high for each group of teachers in one year tended to be the same characteristics that were rated most highly about the same teachers in a different year even though the teachers would generally have had different students making these ratings. Those characteristics rated lowest were also apparently rated on the low end in successive years as well. Thus, the consistency of ratings by students tends to be very high indicating that different students identify the same relative strengths and weaknesses in teachers over a period of time.

Table 5 shows the relationship between the high and low groups on peer ratings. Of particular note here is that in each case except one the peers rated those teachers in the high group more positively, to a significant degree, than those teachers in the low group. Only with the teachers employed the final year of the study did the ratings reverse, that is, the low group rated significantly higher than did the high group. There was no indication

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 5

Mean Ratings and Differences in Mean Ratings by Peers of High and Low Groups of West Des Moines SRI Selected Teachers.

(All differences calculated as "high" minus "low")

	Teachers Employed in 71-72			Teachers Employed in 72-73		Teachers Employed in 73-74
	1st yr.	2nd yr.	3rd yr.	1st yr.	2nd yr.	1st yr.
"High" Mean	3.847	3.797	3.891	3.858	3.884	3.771
"Low" Mean	3.789	3.656	3.786	3.647	3.825	3.810
Mean Diff.	.058	.141	.105	.211	.058	-.039
"t"	2.98**	10.494**	3.903**	13.022**	3.032**	-2.146*

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$

of why the reversal occured in this one case, since five of the six ratings tended to favor the high group.

TABLE 6

Mean Differences Between Peer Ratings of "High" Teachers and "Low" Teachers in Different Years and Correlations Between Ratings in Different Years for West Des Moines SRI Selected Teachers.

(Differences calculated used latter year data minus former year data in each case)

	Teachers Employed in 1971-72						Teachers Employed in 1972-73	
	"High" Group			"Low" Group			"High" Group	"Low" Group
	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	2nd-1st yr.
Mean Diff.	-.049	.044	.093	-.133	-.003	.130	.025	.178
"t"	-3.016**	1.340	3.973**	-4.90**	-.137	5.529**	1.439	7.840**
r	.90	.15	.11	.67	.78	.65	.68	.77

**$p < .01$

Table 6 shows the mean differences between years in the ratings by peers of the high group of teachers and of the low group of teachers as well as the correlations of the item mean ratings between these differing years.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Five of the eight comparisons resulted in significant differences in mean ratings between years. In two of these cases the differences indicate that the teachers were rated lower one year than they had been rated in the previous year. In the other three cases the significant differences indicated a higher rating on successive years than in those ratings made previously. The other three cases resulted in non-significant differences, two of them positive and one negative. Of concern here also is the size of the various correlation coefficients. The coefficients are all positive but the range is from.11 to .90 which indicates that on successive ratings there is only infrequent stability in the actual placement of the items in terms of the mean values which these items hold relative to ratings in other years. Thus, there is a great deal of fluctuation in terms of the items which are considered most positive in one year and in another year. Only four of the eight comparisons show moderately strong positive relationships, that is, of approximately .7 or greater. It appears that the teachers do not see the same strengths and weaknesses in their peers from year to year to the degree that students do.

TABLE 7

Mean Ratings and Differences in Mean Ratings by Administrators of High and Low Groups of West Des Moines SRI Selected Teachers.

(All differences calculated as "high" minus "low")

	Teachers Employed in 71-72			Teachers Employed in 72-73		Teachers Employed in 73-74
	1st yr.#	2nd yr.	3rd yr.	1st yr.	2nd yr.	1st yr.
"High" Mean		3.582	3.655	3.866	3.775	3.587
"Low" Mean		3.218	3.478	3.113	3.611	3.407
Mean Diff.		.364	.177	.753	.163	.179
"t"		6.257**	4.101**	15.82**	4.167**	5.699**

Data not collected for the 1971-72 teachers the 1st yr. employed.

**$\rho < .01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 7 shows the differences in mean ratings of high and low groups as judged by administrators. In each case the high group was rated more positively by administrators than was the low group. All of these differences proved to be statistically significant. Thus, the differences which occur are not likely to be attributable to chance, indicating that there is a real difference in the judgement of the administrators as to the effectiveness of these teachers on those characteristics rated by these administrators, and in each case favoring the high group.

TABLE 8

Mean Differences Between Administrator Ratings of "High" Teachers and "Low" Teachers in Different Years and Correlations Between Ratings in Different Years for West Des Moines SRI Selected Teachers.

(Differences calculated used latter year data minus former year data in each case)

	Teachers Employed in 1971-72						Teachers Employed in 1972-73	
	"High" Group			"Low" Group			"High" Group	"Low" Group
	2nd-1st yr.#	3rd-1st yr.#	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.#	3rd-1st yr.#	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	2nd-1st yr.
Mean Diff.			.072			.260	-.091	.498
"t"			1.569			6.244**	-1.649	14.808**
r			.18			.18	.27	.51

#Data not collected for the 1971-72 teachers the 1st yr. employed.

**$p < .01$

Table 8 shows the differences in ratings for the high group and the differences in ratings for the low group by administrators in successive years as well as the correlation of the item mean ratings across these years. In two of the four cases the ratings in the latter year exceed to a significant degree the ratings for the previous year. In each of these two cases the differences which occured showed that the administrators rated the low group more highly the second year than the first. In the case of the high group there were no statistically significant differences in the ratings in successive years when such ratings were made by adminis-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

trators. The correlation coefficients for the mean item ratings for administrators ratings are very low. That is those items which tended to be high in one case did not necessarily show up in that same position in the next case and those that were low also tended to change position in successive years on the part of the administrators' judgments. Thus, there is little consistency in the way in which administrators are rating these teachers on specific characteristics which are judged to be related to effectiveness in the school.

TABLE 9

Mean Ratings and Differences in Mean Ratings by Students of High and Low Groups of Urbandale SRI Selected Teachers.

(All differences calculated as "high" minus "low")

	Teachers Employed in 71-72			Teachers Employed in 72-73		Teachers Employed in 73-74
	1st yr.	2nd yr.	3rd yr.	1st yr.	2nd yr.	1st yr.
"High" Mean	3.681	3.697	3.663	3.786	3.936	3.856
"Low" Mean	3.420	3.700	3.664	3.408	3.688	3.515
Mean Diff.	.260	-.001	-.000	.378	.247	.340
"t"	5.23**	-.02	-.012	7.03**	6.331**	6.444**

**$p < .01$

Table 9 shows the comparative ratings by students of teachers in the high and those in the low group in the various years in which they were rated. Of particular note in this case is the fact that there are only four significant differences in terms of comparison of high and low groups as rated by students, and in each of those four differences, those in the high group exceed the ratings of those in the low group. In the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

other two situations the differences which occur are minute and can be attributed to chance.

TABLE 10

Mean Differences Between Student Ratings of "High" Teachers and "Low" Teachers in Different Years and Correlations Between Ratings in Different Years for Urbandale SRI Selected Teachers.

(Differences Calculated used latter year data minus former year data in each case)

	Teachers Employed in 1971-72						Teachers Employed in 1972-73	
	"High" Group			"Low" Group			"High" Group	"Low" Group
	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	2nd-1st yr.
Mean Diff.	.015	-.018	-.033	.279	.243	-.036	.150	.280
"t"	.82	-.796	-1.875	5.49**	4.543*	-.549	5.723**	5.645**
r	.98	.98	.99	.92	.90	.87	.97	.92

*$p < .05$ **$p < .01$

Table 10 shows the comparative levels of the ratings by students in different years of teachers in the high group as well as teachers in the low group and the correlations of such ratings in different years. It is of particular interest that those individuals in the low group, who were employed the first year of this study, were rated more highly the second and third years than they were the first year. There is no significant difference between the second and third year for that same group. Thus, the fact that there were no significant differences in the second and third year in the mean student ratings of high and low teachers employed in 1971-72, as seen in Table 9, can be attributed to the fact that those in the low group were rated more highly the second and third year, thus eliminating the differences seen in the first year's ratings of those two groups of teachers. In two other cases (the high and low groups of teachers employed the second year) the ratings for the second year were significantly

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

higher than the first year ratings. Correlation coefficients seen in the mean item ratings as judged by students are exceptionally high in every case with the groups in the Urbandale Schools. This follows the pattern seen in the West Des Moines Schools and indicates that relative strengths and weaknesses as viewed by students are rated in a very consistent and stable manner across years, even though the students of these teachers change.

TABLE 11

Mean Ratings and Differences in Mean Ratings by Peers of High and Low Groups of Urbandale SRI Selected Teachers.

(All differences calculated as "high" minus "low")

	Teachers Employed in 71-72			Teachers Employed in 72-73		Teachers Employed in 73-74
	1st yr.	2nd yr.	3rd yr.	1st yr.	2nd yr.	1st yr.
"High" Mean	3.798	3.786	3.808	3.609	3.759	3.854
"Low" Mean	3.574	3.870	3.690	3.805	3.849	3.485
Mean Diff.	.224	-.083	.118	-.196	-.090	.368
"t"	5.76**	-5.11**	2.982**	-4.47**	-2.719**	9.596**

**$p < .01$

Table 11 shows the differences in mean ratings of the high and low groups as viewed by peers. Each of the mean differences obtained is statistically significant. Of interest here is the fact that half of the differences favor the high group and half of them favor the low group. That is, the groups identified as low by the SRI process exceed those identified as high as often as the high groups exceed the low groups as far as peer ratings are concerned.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 12

Mean Differences Between Peer Ratings of "High" Teachers and "Low" Teachers in Different Years and Correlations Between Ratings in Different Years for Urbandale SRI Selected Teachers.

(Differences calculated based latter year data minus former year data in each case)

	Teachers Employed in 1971-72						Teachers Employed in 1972-73	
	"High" Group			"Low" Group			"High" Group	"Low" Group
	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	3rd-1st yr.	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	2nd-1st yr.
Mean Diff.	-.012	.009	.022	.295	.115	-.179	.150	.043
"t"	-.61	.424	1.741	6.84**	2.900**	-5.292**	7.224**	1.047
r	.70	.56	.82	.30	.57	.47	.82	.69

**$p < .01$

Table 12 shows the differences in ratings across successive years for the high group of teachers as well as for the low group of teachers when such ratings are made by peers. It also shows the correlations of ratings between years when the item means are considered. There seems to be very little pattern to the differences in mean ratings within groups across successive years. In three cases the latter year's ratings were significantly higher than earlier year's ratings. In two of these three cases such differences existed in the low groups and in the other case in the high group. In another case the ratings in the latter year were significantly lower than in a prior year. This was with a low group of teachers.

The correlation coefficients of the mean item ratings in the various years cover the range of positive values from relatively low (.30) to relatively high (.82). There is not a high degree of consistency in the ratings of traits between successive years when such ratings are made by peers.

Table 13 shows the differences in mean ratings for high and low teacher groups as rated by administrators in the Urbandale School District. The differences tend to be somewhat inconsistent in that there are two signifi-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 13

Mean Ratings and Differences in Mean Ratings by Administrators of High and Low Groups of Urbandale SRI Selected Teachers.

(All differences calculated as "high" minus "low")

	Teachers Employed in 71-72			Teachers Employed in 72-73		Teachers Employed 73-74
	1st yr.#	2nd yr.	3rd yr.	1st yr.	2nd yr.	1st yr.
"High" Mean		3.673	3.627	3.638	3.729	3.866
"Low" Mean		3.291	3.500	3.677	4.000	3.519
Mean Diff.		.381	.127	-.039	-.27	.346
"t"		6.72**	1.224	-.55	-10.881**	10.382**

Data not collected for the 1971-72 teachers the 1st yr. employed.

**$\rho < .01$

cant positive differences, which favor the high groups, and one significant negative difference, which favors the low group. The other two differences are non-significant and can be attributed to chance.

TABLE 14

Mean Differences Between Administrator ratings of "High" Teachers and "Low" Teachers in Different Years and Correlations Between Ratings in Different Years for Urbandale SRI Selected Teachers.

(Differences calculated used latter year data minus former year data in each case)

	Teachers Employed in 1971-72						Teachers Employed in 1972-73	
	"High" Group			"Low" Group			"High" Group	"Low" Group
	2nd-1st yr.#	3rd-1st yr.#	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.#	3rd-1st yr.#	3rd-2nd yr.	2nd-1st yr.	2nd-1st yr.
Mean Diff.			-.045			.208	.091	.322
"t"			-1.976*			2.368*	3.107**	4.566**
r			.69			.54	.55	none

Data not collected for the 1971-72 Teachers the 1st yr. employed.

*$\rho < .05$ **$\rho < .01$

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 14 shows the differences in successive years in the mean ratings of the high groups and in the mean ratings of the low groups as perceived by administrators in Urbandale. It also shows the correlation of the mean item ratings for three of the four pairs of ratings. The differences which occur in the levels of the ratings in successive years favor the latter year's ratings; that is, the latter year's ratings were higher than the prior year's ratings in three of the four cases while in one case ratings the second year were significantly lower than the year before.

The correlations in terms of the mean item ratings in successive years tend to be positive. The correlations are in a mid-range indicating that those items that rated highly in one case tended to shift around and not be as high the next time and those that were rated lowest in one case also tended to not be the lowest the next time. There is only a modest relationship between the ways in which various characteristics were viewed one year to the next by school administrators.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine if the Selection Research Incorporated process for identifying teachers who would be likely to succeed in a school district and those who would be less likely to succeed in that same school district actually resulted in differences which could be identified and measured. In order to use some criterion against which to make this judgment, characteristics considered indicative of teacher effectiveness were identified and put into three measuring devices. This was done so SRI teachers could be rated on certain characteristics by students, on other characteristics by peers and on still others by administrators. It was

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

then possible to make comparisons between groups of teachers who were recommended more and less highly by that same process. The comparisons are based on the ratings by the three groups of the characteristics of the high and low teacher groups as identified by the recommendations from SRI.

TABLE 15

The Number and Direction of "t" Test Results Calculated in the West Des Moines Three Year Study

Raters	Significant Difference Favoring "High" Group	Significant Difference Favoring "Low" Group	No Significant Difference
Peers	5	1	0
Administrators	5	0	0
Students	4	0	2
All Raters	14	1	2

A summary of the results of the differences between high and low groups can be found in Tables 15 and 16. Table 15 shows the number of comparisons between groups that were made for those teachers employed in the West Des Moines School District. Five of the six comparisons based on peer group ratings favored the high group with one such comparison favoring the low group. Administrator ratings favored the high group in all five comparisons. Students, in four of the six comparisons, favored the high group with the other two comparisons showing no differences between the two groups. Thus, of the 17 comparisons made, 14, or 82%, favored the high group while only one, or 6%, favored the low group with two, or 12%, favoring neither group.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 16

The Number and Direction of "t" Test Results Calculated in the Urbandale Three Year Study

Raters	Significant Difference Favoring "High" Group	Significant Difference Favoring "Low" Group	No Significant Difference
Peers	3	3	0
Administrators	2	1	2
Students	4	0	2
All Raters	9	4	4

Table 16 shows the same comparative information relative to the ratings made on the two groups of teachers in Urbandale. When rated by peers, there appears to be no difference between the high and low groups since three such comparisons favored the high group and three other comparisons favored the low group. Of the five comparisons made with administrator's ratings, two favored the high group, one favored the low group and two favored neither. The results of the student ratings were the same as in the other district, with four of the six comparisons favoring the high group and two of the comparisons showing no significant differences. Thus of the 17 comparisons made of the ratings by peers, administrators and students, nine, or 53%, of such comparisons favored the more highly recommended group while four, or 24%, favored the low group and the other four, or 24%, favored neither group.

In terms of the consistency of ratings by the various rating groups of characteristics of these teachers, there is little question that the students show the highest consistency. The correlations in successive year's

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ratings ran from .87 to .99 for student ratings when both districts are considered together. The peer ratings were less consistent with the correlations across both districts all being positive and covering the range from .11 to .90 inclusive. Similarly, the consistency in the order in which traits were rated by administrators were also markedly lower than for the student ratings, covering a range of correlation coefficients from .18 to .69.

One, or a combination of several situations may have resulted in the higher consistencies of the students in their ratings of teachers. These include the following possible reasons:

1. Those characteristics on which students were asked to rate teachers may be more readily observable to them than the other characteristics are observable to those individuals who were asked to rate them.
2. The teachers being rated may actually be more stable in those characteristics which students were asked to rate than they are in those characteristics on which the other raters were asked to make judgments.
3. The closer and more intensive interaction of students with their teachers may provide for a more accurate and therefore more consistent rating of teacher characteristics on the part of students than can be found on the part of any other group of raters.

The above list of possibilities is not intended to be exhaustive but only points up some of the possible reasons for the differences which exist. It is obvious, however, that if consistent ratings are desired on teacher characteristics, it would appear that students tend to provide the most consistent and possibly most accurate ratings that can be found in a school district.

On the basis of the results obtained, the following conclusions are warranted:

1. The SRI process of identifying teachers who are likely to be most successful in a given school district appears to be reasonably successful. This can be seen by the fact that of the 34 comparisons of ratings made by peers, administrators and students, approximately 68% of them favored those groups who were most highly recommended by the SRI process while less than 15% favored those groups who were not as highly recommended.
2. The SRI process appears to be most successful in identifying probable success in a district when the criterion of success is determined through ratings by students. In all eight of the 12 cases where comparisons were made of student ratings, the significant differences which existed favored those who were more highly recommended by SRI.
3. The SRI process is not equally effective in every district. It appeared to be particularly useful in the West Des Moines School District where 82% of the comparisons favored the high group and was much less effective in the Urbandale School District where only 53% of the comparisons favored the high group. While it is not the purpose of this study to determine why the SRI process might be more effective in one locale than in another, it is possible that the way in which it was handled in the two districts by the administrators may have contributed to the success or lack of success of this process in the respective districts. There may well have been differences in these two districts relative to such things as the use made of information

which was sent back to the district from SRI as well as a possible loss of confidentiality of some of the information collected for purposes of this study.

4. The SRI service is a valuable process for school districts to use in helping select teachers for employment if it is used in the manner for which it is designed. That is it should not be considered the only criterion for teacher selection, but rather might be used to identify those most likely to succeed after initial screening had been completed. At the same time the information from SRI on the basis of its recommendations should be considered confidential and should not be used as a tool either in attempting to dismiss a teacher or in harassing a teacher.

On the basis of the foregoing, the following recommendations are made:

1. If a school district should elect to utilize the SRI services, it should periodically review the services being offered and perform some evaluation of those individuals selected in conjunction with the types of recommendations made by SRI to determine continued effectiveness of this process.
2. If sufficient numbers of teachers in the two groups identified for this study continue to be employed in these particular districts, it would be well to do another follow-up utilizing the same types of data after a period of approximately an additional three years. In this way the long term affects of the SRI process could be determined.

3. As other selection methods become available for helping school districts identify potentially successful teachers, it would be well to conduct similar studies of the effectiveness of these systems as has been provided in this study. In fact, the results of this study might be used on a comparative basis for looking at other processes. In this way the study completed here will provide some bench marks against which to make judgments concerning other selection processes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

Questionnaires Used To Collect Data for the Final Year Report

SCHOOL _____ CITY _____ GRADE or CLASS _____

NAME OF TEST TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE INSTRUCTOR _____ IBM 507

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement. When you have decided which response is appropriate, blacken the corresponding space with a No. 2 lead pencil. Make your mark as long as the pair of lines, and completely fill the area between the pair of lines. If you change your mind, erase your first mark COMPLETELY. Make no stray marks.

Use the following key in making your responses:

If the statement is always true mark A
If true most of the time mark B
If true about half of the time mark C
If seldom true mark D
If not true mark E

SAMPLE

People are friendly to me A B C D E

Mark the one response which reflects your feelings or attitudes. This paper is not to be graded.

ATION NUMBER

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

As a teacher, I

		A	B	C	D	E
1.	have a sense of humor	1				
2.	make the classwork interesting	2				
3.	try to discover things students are good at doing instead of things they are poor at doing	3				
4.	make assignments that are clear and easy to understand	4				
5.	explain things so that the students are able to understand	5				
6.	listen to what students say about school work	6				
7.	am friendly to each student	7				
8.	encourage students to be friendly and kind to one another	8				
9.	am willing to talk with students during or after class about problems bothering them	9				
10.	shame and embarrass some students	10				
11.	praise a student when he does well	11				
12.	give up on some students	12				
13.	admit when I am wrong or do not know the answer	13				
14.	am fair in handling discipline	14				
15.	expect too much of the students	15				
16.	expect too little of the students	16				
17.	explain clearly how the class grades are determined	17				
18.	grade students too high	18				
19.	grade students too low	19				
20.	like to try new and different ways of teaching	20				
21.	permit students to work in small groups	21				
22.	like students to have ideas that are different	22				
23.	am a happy teacher	23				
		24				
		25				
		26				
		27				
		28				
		29				
		30				
		31				
		32				
		33				
		34				
		35				
		36				
		37				
		38				
		39				
		40				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL _____ CITY _____ GRADE or CLASS _____ IBM 507 PRINTED IN U. S. A.

NAME OF TEST: STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTOR _____

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement. When you have decided which response is appropriate, blacken the corresponding space with a No. 2 lead pencil. Make your mark as long as the pair of lines, and completely fill the area between the pair of lines. If you change your mind, erase your first mark COMPLETELY. Make no stray marks.

Use the following key in making your responses.

If the statement is always true mark	A
If true most of the time mark	B
If true about half of the time mark	C
If seldom true mark	D
If not true mark	E

SAMPLE

People are friendly to me A B C D E

Mark the one response which reflects your feelings or attitides. This paper is not to be graded.

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

My teacher:

		A	B	C	D	E
1. has a sense of humor	1					
2. makes the classwork interesting	2					
3. tries to discover things students are good at doing instead of things they are poor at doing	3					
4. makes assignments that are clear and easy to understand	4					
5. knows how to explain things so that the students are able to understand	5					
6. listens to what we say about school work	6					
7. is friendly to each student	7					
8. encourages students to be friendly and kind to one another	8					
9. is willing to talk with students during or after class about problems bothering them	9					
10. shames and embarrasses some students	10					
11. praises a student when he does well	11					
12. seems to give up on some students	12					
13. admits when he or she is wrong or does not know the answer	13					
14. is fair in handling discipline	14					
15. expects too much of us	15					
16. expects too little of us	16					
17. explains clearly how the class grades are determined	17					
18. grades students too high	18					
19. grades students too low	19					
20. likes to try new and different ways of teaching	20					
21. permits us to work in small groups	21					
22. likes students to have ideas that are different	22					
23. is a happy teacher	23					
	24					
	25					
	26					
	27					
	28					
	29					
	30					
	31					
	32					
	33					
	34					
	35					
	36					
	37					
	38					
	39					
	40					

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL _____ CITY _____ GRADE or CLASS _____ IBM 507 PRINTED IN U.S.A.

NAME OF TEST SELF QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

INSTRUCTOR _____

DIRECTIONS Read each statement. When you have decided which response is appropriate, blacken the corresponding space with a No. 2 lead pencil. Make your mark as long as the pair of lines, and completely fill the area between the pair of lines. If you change your mind, erase your first mark COMPLETELY. Make no stray marks.

Use the following key in making your responses.

If the statement is always true mark A
If true most of the time mark B
If true about half of the time mark C
If seldom true mark D
If not true mark E

SAMPLE

People are friendly to me A B C D E

Mark the one response which reflects your feelings or attitudes.
This paper is not to be graded.

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

		A	B	C	D	E	
1	I get along well with other kids						1
2.	I know how to be happy						2
3.	My parents understand my feelings						3
4.	My teachers think that I'm OK						4
5	I keep my feelings to myself						5
6.	My schoolmates understand how I feel						6
7	My parents are OK						7
8.	My teachers think that what I say is important						8
9	I usually feel good inside						9
10.	My schoolmates are generally kind to me						10
11	My parents think that I'm OK						11
12	My teachers understand how I feel						12
13.	My schoolmates like me						13
14	I understand how my parents feel						14
15.	My teachers are OK						15
16.	My parents think that what I say is important						16
17	I have good ideas						17
18	I understand how my teachers feel						18
19.	My schoolmates are OK						19
20.	I'm OK						20
21.	I feel good about school						21
							22
							23
							24
							25
							26
							27
							28
							29
							30
							31
							32
							33
							34
							35
							36
							37
							38
							39
							40

SCHOOL _____ THIS REPORT IS ABOUT _____ IBM 507 PRINTED IN U. S. A.

NAME OF TEST: CO-WORKER QUESTIONNAIRE (Teacher's Name)

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement. When you have decided which response is appropriate, blacken the corresponding space with a No. 2 lead pencil. Make your mark as long as the pair of lines, and completely blacken the area between the pair of lines. If you change your mind, erase your first mark COMPLETELY. Make no stray marks.

Use the following key in making your responses:

If the statement is true 66 to 100 percent of the time mark A
If the statement is true 33 to 66 percent of the time mark B
If the statement is true 1 to 33 percent of the time mark C
If the statement is never true mark D
If you feel unable to evaluate a particular characteristic mark E

SAMPLE A B C D E

People are friendly to me

Mark the one response which indicates your evaluation of the above named teacher's behavior. This report is for research purposes.

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

The above named teacher:

	A	B	C	D	E
1. accepts assignments on committees for instructional program development	1				
2. shares constructive ideas and/or experiences with other faculty members	2				
3. can be depended upon to handle non-instructional assignments (e.g. supervisory duties)	3				
4. deals fairly with students	4				
5. is friendly toward faculty members	5				
6. is friendly toward other adults (service personnel, parents, etc.)	6				
7. contributes openly and positiveiy in faculty meetings	7				
8. tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing students	8				
9. tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing parents	9				
10. tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing administrators	10				
11. tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing other faculty members	11				
12. is tolerant (open minded) about ideas expressed by others	12				
	13				
	14				
	15				
	16				
	17				
	18				
	19				
	20				
	21				
	22				
	23				
	24				
	25				
	26				
	27				
	28				
	29				
	30				
	31				
	32				
	33				
	34				
	35				
	36				
	37				
	38				
	39				
	40				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOL _____ THIS REPORT IS ABOUT _____ (Teacher's Name)

IBM 507 PRINTED IN U.S.A.

NAME OF TEST **ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE**

DIRECTIONS: Read each statement. When you have decided which response is appropriate, blacken the corresponding space with a No. 2 lead pencil. Make your mark as long as the pair of lines, and completely blacken the area between the pair of lines. If you change your mind, erase your first mark COMPLETELY. Make no stray marks.

Use the following key in making your responses:

If the statement is true 66 to 100 percent of the time mark A
If the statement is true 33 to 66 percent of the time mark B
If the statement is true 1 to 33 percent of the time mark C
If the statement is never true mark D
If you feel unable to evaluate a particular charactoristic mark E

SAMPLE

	A	B	C	D	E
People are friendly to me					

Mark the one response which indicates your evaluation of the above named teacher's behavior. This report is for research purposes.

IDENTIFICATION NUMBER

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

The above named teacher:

		A	B	C	D	E
1.	accepts assignments on committees for instructional program development	1				
2.	shares constructive ideas and/or experiences with other faculty members	2				
3.	can be depended upon to handle non-instructional assignments (e.g. supervisory duties)	3				
4.	deals fairly with students	4				
5.	is friendly toward faculty members	5				
6.	is friendly toward other adults (service personnel, parents, etc.)	6				
7.	contributes openly and positively in faculty meetings	7				
8.	tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing students	8				
9.	tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing parents	9				
10.	tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing administrators	10				
11.	tends to be positive rather than negative when discussing other faculty members	11				
12.	is tolerant (open minded) about ideas expressed by others	12				
13.	makes assignments that are clear and easy for students to understand	13				
14.	spends time helping each student with his or her own special problems	14				
15.	praises the students when they do a good job	15				
16.	shames and embarrasses some students	16				
17.	is friendly to each student	17				
18.	is willing to talk with students during or after class about problems bothering them	18				
19.	encourages students to be friendly and kind to one another	19				
20.	is pleasant and displays respect and warmth when working with students	20				
21.	knows how to explain things so that students are able to understand	21				
22.	stimulates the students to think	22				
23.	plans learning activities in accordance with individual differences	23				
24.	adapts the principles of child growth and development in working with students	24				
25.	demonstrates effective instructional procedures	25				
26.	provides opportunities for students to develop qualities of leadership and self direction	26				
27.	demonstrates familiarity with current curriculum projects and patterns	27				
28.	participates effectively in curriculum development	28				
29.	participates in planning and guidance of student activities	29				
30.	assumes appropriate administrative responsibility for operation of the school as a whole	30				
		31				
		32				
		33				
		34				
		35				
		36				
		37				
		38				
		39				
		40				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B

Mean Ratings of Collected Data
Used in the Final Year Report

MEAN RATINGS BY STUDENTS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE WEST DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1971-72 Mean Ratings 1st Year Teachers		1972-73 Mean Ratings 2nd Year Teachers		1972-73 Mean Ratings 1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.983	3.862	4.006	4.101	3.200	4.047
2	3.792	3.598	3.855	3.907	3.800	3.681
3	3.931	3.634	3.885	3.567	3.833	3.621
4	4.179	4.132	4.030	4.233	4.167	4.055
5	4.341	4.135	4.335	4.319	4.233	4.253
6	3.965	3.913	3.860	3.899	3.833	3.905
7	4.281	4.211	4.289	4.249	3.733	4.252
8	4.238	3.823	4.121	3.843	4.267	3.875
9	3.994	4.238	4.270	4.056	3.700	4.245
10 #	2.977	3.165	2.855	3.022	2.300	3.025
11	4.099	3.637	4.012	3.567	4.034	3.731
12 #	2.879	3.057	3.175	3.112	2.700	3.109
13	4.128	4.363	4.127	4.190	4.267	4.208
14	4.047	4.168	4.145	4.109	3.733	4.059
15 #	2.889	2.795	2.827	2.884	2.533	2.853
16 #	3.215	3.030	3.235	3.246	3.233	3.116
17	3.807	4.145	3.533	3.948	3.133	3.751
18 #	3.148	3.112	3.238	3.195	3.103	3.173
19 #	3.006	2.934	3.027	2.989	2.633	2.883
20	3.994	3.450	3.873	3.546	3.800	3.652
21	3.872	3.444	4.037	3.382	4.069	3.406
22	4.378	4.075	4.548	4.004	4.567	4.021
23	4.517	4.357	4.400	4.375	3.967	4.465
Number of Student Raters	173	334	164	268	30	443

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY STUDENTS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE WEST DES MOINES DISTRICT

	1973-74 Mean Ratings					
	3rd Year Teachers		2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
Item No.	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	4.164	4.193	3.958	4.262	4.089	3.962
2	4.135	3.785	4.292	4.018	4.086	3.577
3	4.365	3.570	4.208	3.710	4.014	3.624
4	4.307	4.070	4.083	4.229	4.237	4.036
5	4.453	4.207	4.417	4.384	4.566	4.216
6	3.987	3.674	4.333	3.931	4.146	3.819
7	4.365	4.189	4.375	4.436	4.374	4.262
8	4.453	3.791	4.625	3.802	4.336	3.672
9	4.613	3.943	4.250	4.130	4.195	4.276
10#	3.160	3.079	2.958	3.148	2.935	3.274
11	4.324	3.894	4.083	3.880	4.230	3.665
12#	3.293	3.070	3.417	3.088	3.200	2.918
13	4.473	4.197	4.625	4.093	4.287	4.164
14	4.387	4.101	4.250	4.153	4.311	4.043
15#	3.216	2.824	3.333	2.994	2.953	2.875
16#	2.932	3.264	3.292	3.216	2.981	3.228
17	3.811	3.841	3.826	4.096	3.885	3.856
18#	3.174	3.264	3.417	3.203	3.159	3.175
19#	2.971	3.022	3.522	3.032	3.272	2.893
20	4.293	3.454	4.083	3.706	4.144	3.469
21	4.027	3.251	4.042	3.754	4.041	3.066
22	4.764	3.956	4.417	4.214	4.478	3.982
23	4.480	4.507	4.542	4.599	4.563	4.365
Number of Student Raters	75	228	24	336	372	441

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

MEAN RATINGS BY STUDENTS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1971-72 Mean Ratings 1st Year Teachers		1972-73 Mean Ratings 2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.936	3.937	3.913	4.435	4.144	3.508
2	3.634	3.429	3.697	3.913	3.773	3.032
3	3.656	3.475	3.823	3.957	3.894	3.258
4	3.890	3.694	4.026	3.935	4.106	3.730
5	4.081	3.857	4.142	4.022	4.220	3.810
6	4.033	3.790	3.910	3.844	4.003	3.613
7	4.230	3.984	4.202	4.500	4.344	3.873
8	3.877	3.746	3.839	3.870	3.958	3.587
9	4.224	3.787	4.019	3.891	4.316	3.903
10 #	2.861	2.661	2.809	2.913	3.062	2.571
11	3.958	3.429	3.884	3.304	3.986	3.413
12 #	2.936	2.587	2.993	2.778	2.843	2.790
13	4.004	3.841	4.049	3.689	4.089	3.524
14	4.004	3.794	4.021	4.348	3.935	3.810
15 #	2.646	2.371	2.597	2.717	2.868	2.452
16 #	3.124	2.694	3.087	3.391	3.076	3.161
17	3.912	2.976	4.089	3.294	3.886	3.460
18 #	2.936	3.071	3.017	2.968	3.040	3.279
19 #	2.772	2.095	2.778	2.333	2.755	2.833
20	3.713	3.571	3.739	4.043	3.896	3.213
21	3.859	4.032	3.986	4.087	4.031	3.667
22	4.108	3.762	4.139	4.111	4.346	3.790
23	4.283	4.098	4.275	4.761	4.517	4.115
Number of Student Raters	446	57	577	46	291	63

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY STUDENTS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

	1973-74 Mean Ratings					
	3rd Year Teachers		2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
Item No.	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.906	4.386	4.403	4.023	4.089	3.780
2	3.763	3.705	4.152	3.721	3.949	3.165
3	3.689	3.250	4.071	3.571	3.994	3.299
4	4.061	3.955	4.189	3.907	4.201	3.780
5	4.141	4.070	4.406	3.976	4.360	3.767
6	3.769	3.705	4.289	3.976	4.048	3.758
7	4.155	4.432	4.267	4.163	4.359	4.094
8	3.909	3.907	4.056	4.140	4.144	3.648
9	4.060	3.818	4.289	4.333	4.250	4.120
10#	2.860	3.045	3.132	2.833	2.981	3.068
11	3.879	3.419	4.036	3.953	4.096	3.774
12#	3.044	2.967	3.191	2.744	3.157	3.039
13	3.947	4.159	4.344	3.860	4.236	4.030
14	3.841	3.767	4.244	3.857	4.102	3.877
15#	2.746	2.667	2.913	2.476	2.914	2.474
16#	2.994	3.182	3.148	3.140	3.105	3.146
17	4.006	3.886	4.201	4.093	3.955	3.880
18#	3.006	3.136	3.113	3.143	3.121	3.108
19#	2.726	2.523	2.964	2.698	2.990	2.717
20	3.623	3.386	3.914	3.488	3.885	3.081
21	3.889	4.341	4.199	4.093	3.908	3.374
22	3.979	4.023	4.426	4.163	4.333	3.698
23	4.266	4.545	4.595	4.488	4.513	4.185
Number of Student Raters	340	44	197	43	314	236

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

MEAN RATINGS BY PEERS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED
OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED
OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE WEST DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1971-72 Mean Ratings 1st Year Teachers		1972-73 Mean Ratings 2nd Year Teachers		1972-73 Mean Ratings 1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.863	3.935	3.792	3.676	3.880	3.707
2	3.887	3.788	3.792	3.716	3.828	3.630
3	3.762	3.826	3.776	3.658	3.897	3.670
4	3.934	3.839	3.792	3.667	3.862	3.701
5	3.984	3.896	3.868	3.720	3.897	3.735
6	3.950	3.909	3.906	3.716	3.897	3.740
7	3.568	3.486	3.638	3.493	3.621	3.307
8	3.819	3.658	3.788	3.689	3.862	3.564
9	3.851	3.746	3.792	3.627	3.846	3.687
10	3.762	3.700	3.717	3.500	3.852	3.581
11	3.883	3.818	3.865	3.775	3.966	3.741
12	3.904	3.870	3.849	3.635	3.897	3.706
Number of Student Raters	63	88	53	74	29	111

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY PEERS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED
OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED
OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE WEST DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1973-74 Mean Ratings 3rd Year Teachers HR or R	3rd Year Teachers CR or NR	2nd Year Teachers HR or R	2nd Year Teachers CR or NR	1st Year Teachers HR or R	1st Year Teachers CR or NR
1	3.875	3.883	3.880	3.825	3.735	3.817
2	3.914	3.774	3.846	3.815	3.731	3.768
3	3.971	3.918	4.000	3.866	3.809	3.902
4	3.941	3.741	3.962	3.891	3.816	3.900
5	3.886	3.937	3.923	3.935	3.885	3.918
6	3.914	3.885	3.846	3.955	3.893	3.858
7	3.882	3.635	3.769	3.688	3.593	3.521
8	3.823	3.746	3.846	3.761	3.733	3.770
9	3.878	3.750	3.846	3.741	3.779	3.720
10	3.848	3.612	3.846	3.715	3.685	3.770
11	3.823	3.746	3.923	3.873	3.801	3.863
12	3.943	3.806	3.923	3.846	3.795	3.918
Number of Peer Raters	35	63	26	92	122	97

MEAN RATINGS BY PEERS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1971-72 Mean Ratings		1972-73 Mean Ratings			
	1st Year Teachers		2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.870	3.466	3.848	3.917	3.709	3.750
2	3.779	3.421	3.833	3.929	3.729	3.846
3	3.786	3.466	3.860	3.923	3.519	3.500
4	3.887	3.555	3.821	3.929	3.638	3.923
5	3.939	3.789	3.861	4.000	3.767	4.000
6	3.861	3.833	3.881	4.000	3.733	4.000
7	3.614	3.277	3.667	3.643	3.458	3.364
8	3.744	3.555	3.761	3.786	3.500	3.769
9	3.652	3.533	3.717	3.769	3.500	3.750
10	3.782	3.800	3.705	3.769	3.517	3.923
11	3.801	3.588	3.752	3.846	3.596	3.846
12	3.867	3.611	3.731	3.929	3.650	4.000
Number of Peer Raters	131	19	108	14	60	13

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY PEERS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1973-74 Mean Ratings 3rd Year Teachers HR or R	3rd Year Teachers CR or NR	2nd Year Teachers HR or R	2nd Year Teachers CR or NR	1st Year Teachers HR or R	1st Year Teachers CR or NR
1	3.906	3.571	3.872	3.786	3.890	3.692
2	3.806	3.571	3.804	3.857	3.895	3.489
3	3.843	3.714	3.750	3.769	3.833	3.435
4	3.888	3.857	3.922	3.929	3.929	3.511
5	3.847	3.714	3.863	4.000	3.909	3.723
6	3.888	3.714	3.900	4.000	3.930	3.681
7	3.762	3.429	3.510	3.714	3.714	3.108
8	3.776	3.714	3.686	3.929	3.873	3.369
9	3.742	3.714	3.706	3.643	3.831	3.347
10	3.663	3.714	3.600	3.857	3.771	3.488
11	3.827	3.714	3.680	3.714	3.819	3.565
12	3.753	3.857	3.824	4.000	3.852	3.413
Number of Peer Raters	98	7	51	14	88	47

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE WEST DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1972-73 Mean Ratings			
	2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.700	3.438	4.000	3.444
2	3.700	3.313	4.000	3.111
3	3.800	3.500	4.000	3.300
4	3.700	3.188	4.000	3.050
5	3.900	3.188	4.000	3.150
6	3.800	3.250	3.750	3.300
7	3.200	3.000	3.750	2.600
8	3.600	3.313	3.250	3.000
9	3.500	3.313	3.250	3.050
10	3.444	3.214	4.000	2.933
11	3.500	3.400	3.500	3.300
12	3.600	3.267	4.000	3.250
13	3.300	3.333	3.500	2.947
14	3.800	2.938	4.000	3.150
15	4.000	3.400	4.000	3.250
16 #	3.222	3.200	4.000	3.056
17	3.800	3.063	3.750	3.000
18	3.700	3.250	4.000	3.050
19	3.800	3.000	4.000	3.200
20	3.700	2.938	3.750	2.950
21	3.500	3.333	4.000	3.250
22	3.600	3.300	4.000	3.200
23	3.700	3.125	3.750	2.950
24	3.800	2.928	4.000	2.950
25	3.500	3.125	4.000	3.200
26	3.600	3.067	4.000	3.684
27	3.200	3.541	4.000	3.000
28	3.200	3.167	3.750	2.895
29	3.600	3.067	4.000	2.850
30	3.000	3.363	4.000	3.333
Number of Administrator Raters	10	16	4	20

#Item 16 is a negatively worded statement. It's weighted value was reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

Note: No administrator ratings were collected for the 1971-72 school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE WEST DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT

	1973-74 Mean Ratings					
	3rd Year Teachers		2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
Item No.	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.571	3.600	4.000	3.684	3.526	3.350
2	3.714	3.545	3.500	3.789	3.500	3.523
3	3.429	3.455	4.000	3.579	3.750	3.636
4	3.714	3.545	3.750	3.737	3.708	3.455
5	3.857	3.273	4.000	3.895	3.583	3.545
6	3.571	3.364	3.750	3.737	3.625	3.500
7	3.571	3.455	3.000	3.316	3.292	3.136
8	3.571	3.636	3.750	3.684	3.583	3.455
9	3.857	3.455	3.500	3.579	3.417	3.500
10	3.666	3.333	3.750	3.714	3.347	3.312
11	3.857	3.455	4.000	3.737	3.500	3.545
12	3.571	3.636	4.000	3.632	3.542	3.591
13	3.857	3.636	3.750	3.444	3.583	3.500
14	3.714	3.636	4.000	3.737	3.792	3.455
15	3.714	3.909	4.000	3.737	3.833	3.523
16#	3.400	3.858	3.500	3.563	3.583	3.648
17	3.714	3.545	3.750	3.632	3.625	3.364
18	3.571	3.455	4.000	3.632	3.667	3.545
19	3.714	3.455	4.000	3.722	3.750	3.545
20	3.714	3.636	3.500	3.632	3.500	3.500
21	3.857	3.636	4.000	3.684	3.833	3.500
22	3.666	3.636	3.750	3.611	3.708	3.318
23	3.429	3.455	4.000	3.474	3.542	3.500
24	3.666	3.273	3.750	3.526	3.583	3.294
25	3.571	3.364	4.000	3.684	3.750	3.545
26	3.500	3.182	4.000	3.555	3.590	3.318
27	3.666	3.300	3.250	3.263	3.526	3.200
28	3.666	3.300	3.250	3.277	3.400	2.850
29	3.857	3.091	3.750	3.368	3.521	2.955
30	3.429	3.222	4.000	3.733	3.458	3.117
Number of Administrator Raters	7	11	4	19	24	22

#Item 16 is a negatively worded statement. It's weighted value was reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1972-73 Mean Ratings			
	2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	3.741	3.000	3.750	4.000
2	3.667	3.500	3.750	3.000
3	3.593	3.250	3.375	3.667
4	3.815	3.250	3.813	3.667
5	3.593	4.000	3.750	3.667
6	3.731	4.000	3.750	4.000
7	3.519	3.000	3.375	2.667
8	3.741	3.750	3.688	4.000
9	3.769	3.750	3.625	4.000
10	3.700	3.666	3.571	4.000
11	3.630	3.500	3.438	4.000
12	3.593	3.250	3.813	3.667
13	3.741	3.250	3.666	3.000
14	3.778	3.250	3.813	3.667
15	3.815	3.500	3.938	3.667
16 #	3.880	3.000	3.715	4.000
17	3.778	3.500	3.625	4.000
18	3.963	3.500	3.875	4.000
19	3.815	3.500	3.750	3.667
20	3.815	3.250	3.688	4.000
21	3.741	3.000	3.625	3.000
22	3.630	2.750	3.750	3.333
23	3.519	3.000	3.750	4.000
24	3.407	3.333	3.313	3.000
25	3.630	3.250	3.563	3.667
26	3.593	3.000	3.500	4.000
27	3.444	2.750	3.813	3.667
28	3.370	2.750	3.375	3.667
29	3.630	3.250	3.563	4.000
30	3.556	3.000	3.125	3.667
Number of Administrator Raters	27	4	16	3

#Item 16 is a negatively worded statement. It's weighted value was reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

Note: No administrator ratings were collected for the 1971-72 school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN RATINGS BY BUILDING ADMINISTRATORS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED OR NOT RECOMMENDED IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1973-74 Mean Ratings 3rd Year Teachers HR or R	3rd Year Teachers CR or NR	2nd Year Teachers HR or R	2nd Year Teachers CR or NR	1st Year Teachers HR or R	1st Year Teachers CR or NR
1	3.647	3.000	3.417	4.000	3.867	3.417
2	3.706	3.000	3.667	4.000	3.867	3.667
3	3.412	3.000	3.500	4.000	3.800	3.583
4	3.647	4.000	3.750	4.000	4.000	3.667
5	3.588	4.000	3.750	4.000	3.867	3.750
6	3.588	4.000	3.833	4.000	4.000	3.667
7	3.471	2.000	3.500	4.000	3.933	3.333
8	3.706	4.000	3.833	4.000	3.867	3.417
9	3.471	4.000	3.833	4.000	3.867	3.583
10	3.353	4.000	3.750	4.000	3.933	3.583
11	3.471	4.000	3.750	4.000	3.800	3.500
12	3.529	4.000	3.833	4.000	3.800	3.583
13	3.824	3.000	3.727	4.000	3.867	3.583
14	3.824	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.933	3.583
15	3.706	4.000	4.000	4.000	4.000	3.917
16#	3.715	4.000	3.833	4.000	3.929	3.750
17	3.813	4.000	3.750	4.000	4.000	3.833
18	4.000	3.000	3.833	4.000	3.933	3.917
19	4.000	4.000	3.833	4.000	3.867	3.667
20	3.765	4.000	3.833	4.000	3.933	3.667
21	3.706	4.000	3.636	4.000	3.867	3.500
22	3.706	3.000	3.727	4.000	3.867	3.333
23	3.647	3.000	3.750	4.000	3.800	3.083
24	3.529	3.000	3.583	4.000	3.667	3.083
25	3.647	3.000	3.636	4.000	3.733	3.083
26	3.706	3.000	3.818	4.000	3.867	3.167
27	3.353	3.000	3.583	4.000	3.800	3.250
28	3.412	3.000	3.667	4.000	3.786	3.417
29	3.471	4.000	3.667	4.000	3.692	3.417
30	3.412	3.000	3.583	4.000	3.846	3.583
Number of Administrator Raters	17	1	12	2	15	12

#Item 16 is a negatively worded statement. It's weighted value was reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

MEAN SELF-RATINGS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED
AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY OR NOT RECOMMENDED
IN THE WEST DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1971-72 Mean Ratings		1972-73 Mean Ratings			
	1st Year Teachers		2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	4.200	4.000	4.000	4.067	4.333	4.136
2	3.867	4.000	4.091	4.000	4.000	3.909
3	4.067	4.000	4.273	3.600	4.000	4.091
4	3.933	4.176	4.182	3.800	4.167	4.136
5	3.933	4.059	4.182	3.933	4.333	4.227
6	4.333	4.278	4.000	4.200	4.167	4.227
7	4.467	4.333	4.455	4.400	4.500	4.364
8	4.933	4.444	4.818	4.333	5.000	4.545
9	4.533	4.611	4.727	4.533	4.667	4.364
10 #	3.467	3.222	3.182	3.067	3.000	3.364
11	4.467	4.667	4.364	4.067	4.167	4.455
12 #	3.667	3.444	3.636	3.067	3.500	3.227
13	4.533	4.556	4.545	4.467	4.667	4.545
14	4.133	4.176	4.273	4.067	4.000	4.136
15 #	2.867	2.556	2.727	2.333	2.333	2.955
16 #	3.067	3.167	2.727	2.867	3.167	3.227
17	4.357	4.235	4.250	3.857	4.000	4.333
18 #	2.857	2.647	2.700	2.533	3.500	2.773
19 #	3.429	3.235	3.300	3.067	3.500	3.045
20	4.533	4.333	4.364	4.200	4.667	4.045
21	3.733	3.944	4.300	3.667	3.833	3.818
22	4.467	4.556	4.455	4.133	4.333	4.045
23	4.333	4.333	4.273	4.000	4.333	4.364
Number of Self-Ratings Reported	15	18	11	15	6	22

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the means. All means are reported in the desired direction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN SELF-RATINGS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED
AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY OR NOT RECOMMENDED
IN THE WEST DES MOINES SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1973-74 Mean Ratings 3rd Year Teachers HR or R	3rd Year Teachers CR or NR	2nd Year Teachers HR or R	2nd Year Teachers CR or NR	1st Year Teachers HR or R	1st Year Teachers CR or NR
1	3.800	4.417	4.400	4.053	4.318	4.238
2	3.600	4.167	4.200	4.053	3.952	3.857
3	3.800	4.083	4.000	4.158	4.091	4.000
4	3.600	4.333	4.400	4.263	3.909	4.476
5	3.600	4.333	4.400	4.158	4.048	4.381
6	3.400	4.083	4.200	4.263	4.273	4.381
7	3.600	4.333	4.400	4.474	4.500	4.524
8	3.800	4.583	4.800	4.579	4.636	4.667
9	4.000	4.917	4.400	4.632	4.773	4.857
10#	2.600	3.250	3.000	3.211	3.318	3.571
11	3.600	4.417	4.000	4.263	4.682	4.450
12#	3.000	3.667	4.000	3.053	3.364	3.333
13	4.000	4.333	4.600	4.526	4.636	4.619
14	3.600	4.250	4.200	4.316	4.136	4.381
15#	2.600	3.000	2.000	2.737	2.500	2.762
16#	2.600	2.750	2.400	3.316	3.091	3.190
17	3.333	3.909	4.200	4.053	4.059	4.750
18#	2.750	2.636	2.800	2.947	2.471	2.857
19#	3.000	2.727	3.000	3.158	3.176	3.238
20	3.800	4.273	4.400	3.895	4.545	4.000
21	3.600	3.917	4.000	4.053	4.143	3.667
22	3.800	4.333	4.000	4.211	4.773	4.381
23	3.800	4.111	4.400	4.368	4.455	4.238
Number of Self-Ratings Reported	5	12	5	19	22	21

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the means. All means are reported in the desired direction.

MEAN SELF-RATINGS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED
AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY OR NOT RECOMMENDED
IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1971-72 Mean Ratings		1972-73 Mean Ratings			
	1st Year Teachers		2nd Year Teachers		1st Year Teachers	
	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR	HR or R	CR or NR
1	4.185	4.750	4.250	4.667	4.313	3.500
2	3.926	3.500	3.964	4.667	3.938	3.500
3	4.074	4.500	4.357	4.667	4.375	3.750
4	4.037	3.750	4.107	4.333	4.250	4.000
5	4.074	4.500	4.000	4.000	4.188	4.000
6	4.556	4.500	4.357	4.667	4.438	4.000
7	4.519	4.250	4.607	4.667	4.438	4.500
8	4.519	4.750	4.500	5.000	4.563	4.500
9	4.654	4.750	4.607	5.000	4.688	4.750
10 #	3.222	3.250	3.214	3.333	3.062	3.000
11	4.370	4.500	4.429	4.333	4.563	4.250
12 #	3.037	3.500	3.289	3.333	3.500	3.250
13	4.444	4.500	4.500	4.667	4.563	4.500
14	4.000	4.000	4.036	4.000	4.125	3.750
15 #	2.704	3.000	3.071	3.000	2.812	2.250
16 #	2.963	2.750	3.179	3.000	2.750	3.000
17	3.783	2.000	4.125	3.000	4.000	4.000
18 #	2.917	2.667	3.043	3.000	2.538	2.000
19 #	3.043	2.667	3.391	3.000	3.692	3.000
20	4.185	4.500	4.250	4.333	4.813	4.250
21	4.111	4.500	4.107	5.000	4.188	4.500
22	4.519	4.500	4.536	5.000	4.625	4.250
23	4.333	4.750	4.296	5.000	4.438	4.000
Number of Self-Ratings Reported	27	4	28	3	16	4

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEAN SELF-RATINGS FOR TEACHERS WHO WERE HIGHLY RECOMMENDED OR RECOMMENDED
AND TEACHERS WHO WERE CONDITIONALLY OR NOT RECOMMENDED
IN THE URBANDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Item No.	1973-74 Mean Ratings 3rd Year Teachers HR or R	3rd Year Teachers CR or NR	2nd Year Teachers HR or R	2nd Year Teachers CR or NR	1st Year Teachers HR or R	1st Year Teachers CR or NR
1	4.111	4.500	4.400	3.667	4.333	4.091
2	4.000	4.500	4.200	3.667	4.056	3.909
3	4.000	5.000	4.556	4.333	4.333	3.909
4	3.944	4.500	4.100	4.000	4.444	4.091
5	4.056	4.500	4.400	3.667	4.500	4.182
6	4.333	4.500	4.700	4.333	4.667	4.364
7	4.389	4.500	4.400	4.333	4.500	4.545
8	4.444	5.000	4.500	4.333	4.667	4.273
9	4.647	4.500	4.700	4.667	4.882	4.636
10#	3.278	4.000	3.200	2.333	3.389	2.818
11	4.167	4.000	4.200	4.333	4.500	4.455
12#	3.611	3.500	2.900	2.333	3.611	2.545
13	4.389	4.500	4.400	3.667	4.444	4.727
14	4.056	4.500	4.000	4.333	4.333	4.273
15#	3.056	3.500	3.000	3.000	3.111	2.636
16#	2.944	3.500	3.200	3.333	3.333	3.091
17	4.250	4.500	3.900	4.667	4.118	4.455
18#	2.750	3.500	3.100	1.333	3.176	2.727
19#	3.375	3.500	3.222	3.000	3.471	2.818
20	4.056	4.500	4.100	4.000	4.389	3.636
21	4.167	4.500	4.300	4.667	4.111	3.818
22	4.278	5.000	4.600	4.667	4.667	4.273
23	4.353	5.000	4.500	4.000	4.444	4.364
Number of Self Ratings Reported	18	2	10	3	18	11

#These items are classified as reverse items since they are negatively worded. For these to be compared with the remaining positive statements their weighted values were reversed in calculating the mean. All means are reported in the desired direction.